

ROUTING AND TRANSMITTAL SLIP		Date
		25 OCT 1985
TO: (Name, office symbol, room number, building, Agency/Post)	Initials	Date
1. EXO/DDA	<i>ABP</i>	<i>10/25</i>
2. DDA	<i>[Signature]</i>	25 OCT 1985
3.		
4. <i>DDA/Reg - Ric</i>		
5.		
Action	File	Note and Return
Approval	For Clearance	Per Conversation
As Requested	For Correction	Prepare Reply
Circulate	For Your Information	See Me
Comment	Investigate	Signature
Coordination	Justify	

REMARKS

cc: each DA Office Director
DA Plans

*done 10/25/85
[initials]*

DO NOT use this form as a RECORD of approvals, concurrences, disposals, clearances, and similar actions

FROM: (Name, org. symbol, Agency/Post)

Room No.—Bldg.

Phone No.

5041-102

*U.S.G.P.O.: 1963 - 421-529/320

OPTIONAL FORM 41 (Rev. 7-76)
Prescribed by GSA
FPMR (41 CFR) 101-11.206

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT

ROUTING SLIP

TO:

		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI		X		
2	DDCI		X		
3	EXDIR		X		
4	D/ICS		X		
5	DDI		X		
6	DDA		X		
7	DDO		X		
8	DDS&T		X		
9	Chm/NIC				
10	GC		X		
11	IG		X		
12	Compt		X		
13	D/OLL		X		
14	D/PAO		X		
15	VC/NIC		X		
16	NIO/USSR		x		
17	D/SOVA		x		
18	NIO/AL		x		
19					
20					
21					
22					

SUSPENSE

Date

Remarks Some of you received a draft of the President's speech earlier; this is the "final" version plus a fact sheet and additional background on regional initiatives.

Executive Secretary

24 Oct 85

Date

3637 (10-81)

STAT

Executive Registry

85- 4237

85-3630

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

W.D.A.
10/24/85

RECEIVED
OCT 24 1985

60-1

October 24, 1985

Executive Secretaries
State, Defense & CIA:

Attached please find the President's
Speech, the Fact Sheet and background
material on Regional Initiatives.

W. F. Martin
William F. Martin

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(New York, New York)

For Release at 10:00 am EDT

October 24, 1985

TEXT OF THE ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT
TO THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF THE UNITED NATIONS
AT THE COMMEMORATION OF THE FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

United Nations
New York, New York
October 24, 1985

Forty years ago, the world awoke daring to believe hatred's unyielding grip had finally been broken -- daring to believe the torch of peace would be protected in liberty's firm grasp.

Forty years ago, the world yearned to dream again innocent dreams, to believe in ideals with innocent trust. Dreams of trust are worthy, but in these 40 years too many dreams have been shattered, too many promises have been broken, too many lives have been lost. The painful truth is that the use of violence to take, to exercise, and to preserve power remains a persistent reality in much of the world.

The vision of the U.N. Charter -- to spare succeeding generations this scourge of war -- remains real. It still stirs our souls and warms our hearts. But it also demands of us a realism that is rockhard, clear-eyed, steady and sure -- a realism that understands the nations of the United Nations are not united.

I come before you this morning preoccupied with peace, with ensuring that the differences between some of us not be permitted to degenerate into open conflict. And I come offering for my own country a new commitment, a fresh start.

On this U.N. anniversary, we acknowledge its successes: the decisive action during the Korean War; negotiation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty; strong support for decolonization; and the laudable achievements by the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees.

Nor must we close our eyes to this organization's disappointments: its failure to deal with real security issues, the total inversion of morality in the infamous Zionism-is-racism resolution, the politicization of too many agencies, the misuse of too many resources.

The U.N. is a political institution and politics requires compromise. We recognize that. But let us remember -- from those first days, one guiding star was supposed to light our path toward the U.N. vision of peace and progress -- the star of freedom.

What kind of people will we be 40 years from today? May we answer -- free people, worthy of freedom, and firm in the conviction that freedom is not the sole prerogative of a chosen few, but the universal right of all God's children.

This is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights set forth in 1948. And this is the affirming flame the United States has held high to a watching world. We champion freedom not only because it is practical and beneficial, but because it is morally right and just.

NOTE

Page 2

Free people, whose governments rest upon the consent of the governed, do not wage war on their neighbors. Free people, blessed by economic opportunity, and protected by laws that respect the dignity of the individual, are not driven toward the domination of others.

We readily acknowledge that the United States is far from perfect. Yet we have endeavored earnestly to carry out our responsibilities to the Charter these past 40 years, and we take national pride in our contributions to peace:

We take pride in 40 years of helping avert a new world war and pride in our alliances that protect and preserve us and our friends from aggression. We take pride in the Camp David agreements and our efforts for peace in the Middle East rooted in resolutions 242 and 338; in supporting Pakistan, target of outside intimidation; in assisting El Salvador's struggle to carry forward its democratic revolution; in answering the appeal of our Caribbean friends in Grenada; in seeing Grenada's representative here today, voting the will of its own people. And we take pride in our proposals to reduce the weapons of war.

We submit this history as evidence of our sincerity of purpose. But today it is more important to speak to you about what my country proposes to do, in these closing years of the 20th century, to bring about a safer, a more peaceful, a more civilized world.

Let us begin with candor -- with words that rest on plain and simple facts. The differences between America and the Soviet Union are deep and abiding.

The United States is a democratic nation. Here the people rule. We build no walls to keep them in, nor organize any system of police to keep them mute. We occupy no country. The only land abroad we occupy is beneath the graves where our heroes rest. What is called the West is a voluntary association of free nations, all of whom fiercely value their independence and their sovereignty. And as deeply as we cherish our beliefs, we do not seek to compel others to share them.

When we enjoy these vast freedoms as we do, it is difficult for us to understand the restrictions of dictatorships which seek to control each institution and every facet of people's lives, the expression of their beliefs, their movements, and their contacts with the outside world. It is difficult for us to understand the ideological premise that force is an acceptable way to expand a political system.

We Americans do not accept that any government has the right to command and order the lives of its people, that any nation has an historic right to use force to export its ideology. This belief -- regarding the nature of man and the limitations of government -- is at the core of our deep and abiding differences with the Soviet Union, differences that put us into natural conflict -- and competition -- with one another.

We would welcome enthusiastically a true competition of ideas, welcome a competition of economic strength and scientific and artistic creativity, and, yes, welcome a competition for the good will of the world's people. But we cannot accommodate ourselves to the use of force and subversion to consolidate and expand the reach of totalitarianism.

MORE

Page 3

When Mr. Gorbachev and I meet in Geneva next month, I look to a fresh start in the relationship of our two nations. We can and should meet in the spirit that we can deal with our differences peacefully. That is what we expect.

The only way to resolve differences is to understand them. We must have candid and complete discussions of where dangers exist and where peace is being disrupted. Make no mistake: our policy of open and vigorous competition rests on a realistic view of the world. Therefore, at Geneva, we must review the reasons for the current level of mistrust.

For example, in 1972 the international community negotiated in good faith a ban on biological and toxin weapons; in 1975 we negotiated the Helsinki accords on human rights and freedoms; and during the decade just past, the United States and the Soviet Union negotiated several agreements on strategic weapons. Yet, we feel it will be necessary at Geneva to discuss with the Soviet Union what we believe are their violations of a number of the provisions in all of these agreements. Indeed, this is why it is important that we have this opportunity to air our differences through face-to-face meetings -- to let frank talk substitute for anger and tension.

The United States has never sought treaties merely to paper over differences. We continue to believe that a nuclear war is one that cannot be won and must never be fought. That is why we have sought, for nearly 10 years, still seek, and will discuss in Geneva radical, equitable, verifiable reductions in these vast arsenals of offensive nuclear weapons.

At the beginning of the latest round of the ongoing negotiations in Geneva, the Soviet Union presented a specific proposal involving numerical values. We are studying the Soviet counter-proposal carefully. I believe that within their proposal there are seeds which we should nurture, and in the coming weeks we will seek to establish a genuine process of give-and-take.

The United States is also seeking to discuss with the Soviet Union in Geneva the vital relationship between offensive and defensive systems, including the possibility of moving toward a more stable and secure world in which defenses play a growing role.

The ballistic missile is the most awesome, threatening, and destructive weapon in the history of man. Thus, I welcome the interest of the new Soviet leadership in the reduction of offensive strategic forces. Ultimately, we must remove this menace -- once and for all -- from the face of this Earth.

Until that day, the United States seeks to escape the prison of mutual terror by research and testing that could, in time, enable us to neutralize the threat of these ballistic missiles and, ultimately, render them obsolete.

How is Moscow threatened -- if the capitals of other nations are protected? We do not ask that the Soviet leaders -- whose country has suffered so much from war -- leave their people defenseless against foreign attack. Why then do they insist that we remain undefended? Who is threatened if Western research -- and Soviet research that is itself well-advanced -- should develop a non-nuclear system which would threaten not human beings, but only ballistic missiles?

MORE

Page 4

Surely, the world will sleep more secure when these missiles have been rendered useless, militarily and politically, when the Sword of Damocles that has hung over our planet for too many decades is lifted by Western and Russian scientists working to shield their cities and their citizens and one day shut down space as an avenue for weapons of mass destruction.

If we are destined by history to compete, militarily, to keep the peace, then let us compete in systems that defend our societies rather than weapons which can destroy us both, and much of God's creation along with us.

Some 18 years ago, then-Premier Aleksei Kosygin was asked about a moratorium on the development of an anti-missile defense system. The official Soviet news agency, TASS, reported he replied with these words:

"I believe that defensive systems, which prevent attack, are not the cause of the arms race, but constitute a factor preventing the death of people.... Maybe an antimissile system is more expensive than an offensive system, but it is designed not to kill people but to preserve human lives."

Preserving lives. No peace is more fundamental than that. Great obstacles lie ahead, but they should not deter us. Peace is God's commandment. Peace is the holy shadow cast by men treading on the path of virtue.

But just as we all know what peace is, we certainly know what peace is not.

Peace based on repression cannot be true peace and is secure only when individuals are free to direct their own governments.

Peace based on partition cannot be true peace. Put simply: nothing can justify the continuing and permanent division of the European continent. Walls of partition and distrust must give way to greater communication for an Open World. Before leaving for Geneva, I shall make major new proposals to achieve this goal.

Peace based on mutual fear cannot be true peace because staking our future on a precarious balance of terror is not good enough. The world needs a balance of safety.

Finally, a peace based on averting our eyes from trouble cannot be true peace. The consequences of conflict are every bit as tragic when the destruction is contained within one country.

Real peace is what we seek, and that is why today the United States is presenting an initiative that addresses what will be a central issue in Geneva -- the resolution of regional conflicts in Africa, Asia, and Central America.

Our own position is clear: as the oldest nation of the New World, as the first anti-colonial power, the United States rejoiced when decolonization gave birth to so many new nations after World War II. We have always supported the right of the people of each nation to define their own destiny. We have given \$300 billion since 1945 to help people of other countries. And we have tried to help friendly governments defend against aggression, subversion, and terror.

MORE

Page 5

We have noted with great interest similar expressions of peaceful intent by leaders of the Soviet Union. I am not here to challenge the good faith of what they say. But isn't it important for us to weigh the record, as well?

- In Afghanistan, there are 118,000 Soviet troops prosecuting war against the Afghan people.
- In Cambodia, 140,000 Soviet-backed Vietnamese soldiers wage a war of occupation.
- In Ethiopia, 1,700 Soviet advisers are involved in military planning and support operations along with 2,500 urban combat troops.
- In Angola -- 1,200 Soviet military advisers involved in planning and supervising combat operations, along with 35,000 Cuban troops.
- In Nicaragua -- some 8,000 Soviet bloc and Cuban personnel, including about 3,500 military and secret police personnel.

All of these conflicts -- some of them under way for a decade -- originate in local disputes but they share a common characteristic: they are the consequence of an ideology imposed from without, dividing nations and creating regimes that are, almost from the day they take power, at war with their own people. And in each case, Marxism-Leninism's war with the people becomes war with their neighbors.

These wars are exacting a staggering human toll and threaten to spill across national boundaries and trigger dangerous confrontations. Where is it more appropriate than right here at the United Nations to call attention to Article 2 of our Charter which instructs members to refrain "from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state...."?

During the past decade these wars played a large role in building suspicions and tensions in my country over the purpose of Soviet policy. This gives us an extra reason to address them seriously today.

Last year I proposed from this podium that the United States and Soviet Union hold discussions on some of these issues, and we have done so. But I believe these problems need more than talk.

For that reason, we are proposing, and are fully committed to support, a regional peace process that seeks progress on three levels:

First, we believe the starting point must be a process of negotiation among the warring parties in each country I've mentioned -- which, in the case of Afghanistan, includes the Soviet Union. The form of these talks may and should vary, but negotiations -- and an improvement of internal political conditions -- are essential to achieving an end to violence, the withdrawal of foreign troops and national reconciliation.

MORE

Page 6

There is a second level: once negotiations take hold and the parties directly involved are making real progress, representatives of the United States and the Soviet Union should sit down together. It is not for us to impose any solutions in this separate set of talks. Such solutions would not last. But the issue we should address is how best to support the ongoing talks among the warring parties. In some cases, it might well be appropriate to consider guarantees for any agreements already reached. But in every case the primary task is to promote this goal: verified elimination of the foreign military presence and restraint on the flow of outside arms.

Finally, if these first two steps are successful, we could move on to the third -- welcoming each country back into the world economy so its citizens can share in the dynamic growth that other developing countries -- countries that are at peace -- enjoy. Despite past differences with these regimes, the United States would respond generously to their democratic reconciliation with their own people, their respect for human rights, and their return to the family of free nations.

Of course, until such time as these negotiations result in definitive progress, America's support for struggling democratic resistance forces must not and shall not cease.

This plan is bold. And it is realistic. It is not a substitute for existing peace-making efforts; it complements them. We are not trying to solve every conflict in every region of the globe, and we recognize that each conflict has its own character. Naturally other regional problems will require different approaches. But we believe that the recurrent pattern of conflict that we see in these five cases ought to be broken as soon as possible.

We must begin somewhere, so let us begin where there is great need and great hope. This will be a clear step forward to help people choose their future more freely. Moreover, this is an extraordinary opportunity for the Soviet side to make a contribution to regional peace which in turn can promote future dialogue and negotiations on other critical issues.

With hard work and imagination, there is no limit to what, working together, our nations can achieve. Gaining a peaceful resolution of these conflicts will open whole new vistas for peace and progress -- the discovery that the promise of the future lies not in measures of military defense, or the control of weapons, but in the expansion of individual freedom and human rights.

Only when the human spirit can worship, create, and build, only when people are given a personal stake in determining their own destiny and benefitting from their own risks do societies become prosperous, progressive, dynamic, and free.

We need only open our eyes to the economic evidence all around us. Nations that deny their people opportunity -- in Eastern Europe, Indochina, southern Africa, and Latin America -- without exception are dropping further behind in the race for the future.

But where we see enlightened leaders who understand that economic freedom and personal incentive are key to development, we see economies striding forward. Singapore, Taiwan, and South Korea -- India, Botswana, and China. These are among the current and emerging success stories because they have the courage to give economic incentives a chance.

MORE

Page 7

Let us all heed the simple eloquence in Andrei Sakharov's Nobel Peace Prize message: "International trust, mutual understanding, disarmament and international security are inconceivable without an open society with freedom of information, freedom of conscience, the right to publish and the right to travel and choose the country in which one wishes to live."

At the core, this is an eternal truth. Freedom works. That is the promise of the Open World and awaits only our collective grasp. Forty years ago, hope came alive again for a world that hungered for hope. I believe fervently that hope is still alive.

The United States has spoken with candor and conviction today, but that does not lessen these strong feelings held by every American: It's in the nature of Americans to hate war and its destructiveness. We would rather wage our struggle to rebuild and renew, not to tear down. We would rather fight against hunger, disease, and catastrophe. We would rather engage our adversaries in the battle of ideals and ideas for the future.

These principles emerge from the innate openness and good character of our people -- and from our long struggle and sacrifice for our liberties and the liberties of others. Americans always yearn for peace. They have a passion for life. They carry in their hearts a deep capacity for reconciliation.

Last year at this General Assembly, I indicated there was every reason for the United States and the Soviet Union to shorten the distance between us. In Geneva -- the first meeting between our heads of government in more than 6 years -- Mr. Gorbachev and I will have that opportunity.

So, yes, let us go to Geneva with both sides committed to dialogue. Let both sides go committed to a world with fewer nuclear weapons -- and some day with none. Let both sides go committed to walk together on a safer path into the 21st century and to lay the foundation for enduring peace.

It is time, indeed, to do more than just talk of a better world. It is time to act. And we will act when nations cease to try to impose their ways upon others. And we will act when they realize that we, for whom the achievement of freedom has come dear, will do what we must to preserve it from assault.

America is committed to the world, because so much of the world is inside America. After all, only a few miles from this very room is our Statue of Liberty, past which life began anew for millions -- where the peoples from nearly every country in this hall joined to build these United States.

The blood of each nation courses through the American vein -- and feeds the spirit that compels us to involve ourselves in the fate of this good Earth. It is the same spirit that warms our heart in concern to help ease the desperate hunger that grips proud people on the African continent.

It is the internationalist spirit that came together last month when our neighbor, Mexico, was struck suddenly by an earthquake. Even as the Mexican nation moved vigorously into action -- there were heartwarming offers by other nations offering to help and glimpses of people working together, without concern for national self-interest or gain.

MORE

Page 8

And if there was any meaning to salvage out of that tragedy, it was found one day in a huge mound of rubble that was once the Juarez Hospital in Mexico City.

A week after that terrible event and as another day of despair unfolded -- a team of workers heard a faint sound coming somewhere from the heart of the crushed concrete and twisted steel. Hoping beyond hope, they quickly burrowed toward it.

As the late afternoon light faded, and racing against time, they found what they had heard -- and the first of three baby girls -- newborn infants -- emerged to the safety of the rescue team.

Here is the scene through the eyes of one who was there. "Everyone was so quiet when they lowered that little baby down in a basket covered with blankets. The baby didn't make a sound, either. But the minute they put her in the Red Cross ambulance everybody just got up and cheered."

Well, amidst all that hopelessness and debris came a timely -- and timeless -- lesson for us all. We witnessed the miracle of life.

It is on this that I believe our nations can make a renewed commitment. The miracle of life is given by One greater than ourselves. But once given, each life is ours to nurture and preserve -- to foster not only for today's world but for a better one to come.

There is no purpose more noble than for us to sustain and celebrate life in a turbulent world. That is what we must do now. We have no higher duty -- no greater cause as humans. Life -- and the preservation of freedom to live it in dignity -- is what we are on this Earth to do.

Everything we work to achieve must seek that end so that some day our prime ministers, our premiers, our presidents and our general secretaries will talk not of war and peace -- but only of peace.

We've had 40 years to begin. Let us not waste one more moment to give back to the world all that we can in return for this miracle of life.

Thank you.

• • •

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(New York, New York)

For Release at 10:00 am EDT

October 24, 1985

FACT SHEET

The President's Address to the United Nations General Assembly

The United Nations
New York City
October 24, 1985

In his address to the General Assembly, President Reagan today

- o reviewed the record of the United Nation's forty years,
- o discussed his expectations for next month's meeting with General Secretary Gorbachev, and
- o put forward a major initiative for resolving regional wars that worsened US-Soviet relations in the past decade.

Looking Back: The Forty Year Record

The President, seeing both achievements and failures in the United Nation's record, emphasized that improving it in the future requires re-commitment to the ideas of the Charter -- to human rights and freedom as cornerstones of peace.

- The United Nations Charter still stirs mankind, but it demands realism.
- The use of violence to take, exercise, and preserve power remains widespread. Reaching the goals of the United Nations depends on protecting freedom: free peoples do not commit aggression against their neighbors.
- We acknowledge the United Nation's successes (from the Korean War to the work of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and of UNICEF)...and note its disappointments (from failures in dealing with real security issues to the 1975 Zionism-is-Racism resolution).
- The United States takes pride in contributing to peace, through alliances that protect us and our friends from aggression, through peace-making efforts in the Middle East and elsewhere.
- "But today it is more important to speak to you about what my country proposes to do in these closing years of the 20th Century, to bring about a safer, a more peaceful, a more civilized world."

MORE

Dealing Peacefully with United States-Soviet Differences -- A Fresh Start

The President said that "the only way to resolve differences is to understand them," and that a full discussion of United States-Soviet differences is indispensable to making a "fresh start" in relations at Geneva. Noting that compliance with past agreements would also be discussed, he welcomed recent Soviet counter-proposals on nuclear arms reductions.

- We begin with candor: the differences between the United States and the Soviet Union are deep and abiding.
- We welcome peaceful competition of ideas, but cannot accept force and subversion to extend totalitarianism.
- "When Mr. Gorbachev and I meet in Geneva next month, I look to a fresh start in the relationship of our two nations," the President said.
- On nuclear issues, he will discuss Soviet violations of past agreements, as well as recent Soviet proposals on arms reductions. The President hopes to generate "a genuine process of give and take."
- The United States will seek to discuss with the Soviet Union "the vital relationship between offensive and defensive systems, including the possibility of moving toward a stable and secure world in which defenses play a growing role." The Soviet Union is not threatened by this.

The Search for True Peace

We know what peace is, and what it is not. Before Geneva the President will offer proposals to overcome obstacles to free contact among societies.

- True peace cannot be based on repression: the people must direct their own governments.
- It can't be based on obstacles to communications. The United States seeks freer people-to-people contacts and will make major new proposals before Geneva to advance this goal.
- It can't be based on mutual fear: the world needs a balance of safety, not a balance of terror.
- And it can't be based on turning away from trouble: some of the most tragic wars take place within a single country.

The President's Initiative to Resolve Regional Conflicts -- a Central Issue in Geneva

The heart of the President's speech is an initiative on a series of regional wars in the Third World. All involve significant continuing (and in some cases, growing) Soviet involvement, and did much to worsen United States-Soviet relations under three Adminis-

MORE

Page 3

trations. The President's plan calls for progress at three levels:

- 1) Negotiation among the warring parties
- 2) United States-Soviet discussions, and
- 3) Economic reconstruction

- "Real peace is what we seek", the President said, and the United States initiative aims to break the pattern of five key conflicts in Asia, Africa and Central America.
- In Afghanistan, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Angola and Nicaragua, we see a common characteristic: governments -- supported by outside arms, advisers and often troops -- waging war against their people. This becomes war against their neighbors.
- The Soviet role in these wars did much to worsen United States-Soviet relations. This gives us an extra reason to address them seriously today.
- Last year at the United Nations General Assembly, the President proposed discussions with the Soviet Union on regional conflicts. Such talks have taken place, but these problems need more than talk.
- The President proposed a regional peace process that seeks progress on three levels:
 1. The realistic starting point must be negotiations among the warring parties in each conflict. Negotiations -- and an improvement of internal political conditions -- are essential to achieving an end to violence, withdrawal of foreign troops and national reconciliation.
 2. Once these negotiations make real progress, United States-Soviet discussions could take place. These would not be peace negotiations but would explore how to support agreements reached by the warring parties. The primary task is to eliminate the foreign military presence and restrain the flow of outside arms.
 3. Finally, if these steps are successful, we can help to promote re-integration of these countries into the world economy. The United States would respond generously.
- Of course, without progress, America's support for democratic and resistance forces must not and shall not cease.
- "This plan is bold. And it is realistic. It is not a substitute for existing peace-making efforts," the President said. It doesn't seek to address all conflicts everywhere; only those that fit this pattern. Naturally, other conflicts will require separate approaches.
- The Soviet Union has "an extraordinary opportunity" to contribute to peace in a way that can promote dialogue on other issues.

MORE

Page 4

Looking Ahead -- A Safe Path into the 21st Century

Recounting a story of relief efforts after the Mexican earthquake, the President expressed the American people's readiness to help ease the problems of others. We have no higher duty than to preserve the freedom to live life in dignity.

- The promise of the future lies not in military measures, or even the control of weapons, but in the expansion of individual freedom and human rights.
- Freedom is the key to economic dynamism, but also to peace.
- In Geneva, the first meeting of United States and Soviet leaders in over six years, there is the opportunity to narrow our differences.
- It is time to do more than just talk of a better world; it is time to act.
- America's internationalist spirit spurs us to offer help to others, whether in disaster and famine-relief or in the search for peace.
- The President concluded: "There is no purpose more noble than for us to sustain and celebrate life in a turbulent world. That is what we must do now. We have no higher duty -- no greater cause as humans. Life -- and the preservation of the freedom to live it in dignity -- is what we are on this Earth to do."

• • •

FOR RELEASE AT 10:00 A.M. EDT
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1985

The President's Initiative on Regional Conflict

Background

Soviet interventionism in the 1970's left in its wake a series of repressive regimes, seeking to impose alien ideologies on countries by military force, and kept in power by Soviet military aid. The policies of these regimes have given rise to indigenous opposition seeking to liberalize or overthrow them. The result has been conflicts which are taking a heavy human toll, are spilling across international boundaries, and are drawing in outside military involvement. The President has made clear that our sympathies are with those who resist Soviet expansionism, fight for freedom, and seek genuine self-determination. If these problems cannot be resolved through negotiations and by Soviet restraint, they will only worsen. The President hopes to provide a means by which to pursue political, rather than military solutions to these problems.

Description

In his address to the General Assembly, the President proposed a peace process at three levels to address the continuing wars in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Nicaragua, Angola, and Ethiopia, where Soviet involvement contributed to the deterioration of U.S.-Soviet relations in the 1970's. The initiative is a comprehensive framework designed to improve the prospects for peace in these areas. It complements regional and other international efforts to achieve lasting political solutions. Progress in this can also facilitate an improvement in overall East-West relations.

1. The first level calls for negotiations between the warring parties. The form of such talks in each instance might vary but negotiations and improvement of internal political conditions are essential to achieving an end to violence and true national reconciliation.

2. Once real progress in these areas has been made, the United States and the Soviet Union could hold a separate set of talks. These would not be formal peace negotiations but would explore how these two governments could support regional and other international peace-making efforts. In some cases, such as Afghanistan and Cambodia, the U.S. and USSR might offer guarantees for agreements already reached by the warring parties. In every case, the primary U.S. - Soviet role would be to reduce and eliminate outside military involvement, including verified withdrawal of foreign troops and restraint on the flow of outside arms.

3. If the first two stages are successful, a third element of a long-term solution would become possible: reintegration of the war-torn nations into the international economy. The United States would be willing to contribute generously to democratic reconciliation with their own people, their respect for human rights and their return to the family of free nations.

This approach puts the burden on the warring parties to reach accommodation and offers a framework for achieving superpower restraint. It is clear that no U.S.-Soviet condominium can solve these problems. We must bear in mind that each of these conflicts has its own character and requirements for a political solution. Regional peace-making initiatives like Contadora in Central America and ASEAN's proposals for Cambodia have sought to

more

address precisely these individual characteristics. The U.S. supports those initiatives and believes that this proposal will complement them by providing for participation by the warring parties.

REGIONAL CONFLICTS AND U.S.-SOVIET RELATIONS

Soviet involvement in Third World conflicts has had a direct effect in souring U.S.-Soviet relations, especially over the last decade.

In September, 1984, President Reagan proposed to the UNGA that the United States and the Soviet Union hold periodic exchanges at the policy level on key regions of the world. Over the past year the two sides have held experts talks on the Middle East, Afghanistan, southern Africa, and East Asia. Talks on Central America and the Caribbean will be held at the end of October. While these talks have not produced dramatic breakthroughs, they have been useful for clarifying views and preventing miscalculation. We hope these talks will continue on a more regular basis in the future. The President, however, would like to move beyond exchanging views.

SPECIFIC REGIONAL CONFLICTS

1. Namibia/Angola

Soviet intervention in the Angolan conflict was the first use of surrogate Cuban troops in the 1970s. Cuban forces enabled the present regime to take power, but it has not been able to end the resistance efforts of groups opposing its dictatorship. U.S. attempts to discuss the issue with the Soviets, and especially the Cuban troop issue, drew only brusque responses that the matter was one between the Cubans and Angolans.

U.S. policy for Angola/Namibia is aiming at achieving a negotiated agreement for Namibian independence under United Nations Security Council Resolution 435-78 and in that context the withdrawal of both South African forces from Namibia and Cuban forces from Angola. To this end, we have worked to bring the two sides, Angola and South Africa, into a negotiating framework in which they could reach the hard decisions necessary for such a settlement.

The President's initiative is aimed at seeking a way to reduce regional tensions and to test Soviet willingness to play a constructive role in Angola. The Soviet Union is directly involved in the Angolan conflict and bears a responsibility for resolving it. In fact, Soviet military involvement appears to be growing. U.S. efforts will continue to seek a resolution of the international aspects of the problem. The Angolan parties must reconcile themselves. We are calling on the Soviet Union both to contribute to this process and to play a constructive role in promoting reconciliation.

2. Afghanistan

The December 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan ended any prospects for ratification of the SALT II accord and led to the imposition of sanctions by the U.S. and western countries including Japan, sanctions which included the boycott of the Moscow Olympics and the embargo on U.S. grain sales. The Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and the continuing brutal repression of the country has outraged world public opinion and seriously damaged East-West relations. In diplomatic consultations, including at the highest levels, the U.S. has strongly urged Moscow to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan. Every year since the invasion, the UN General Assembly has called for foreign troop withdrawal.

U.S. policy toward Afghanistan is based on achieving a negotiated political settlement based on four underlying principles:
more

complete withdrawal of Soviet troops; restoration of Afghanistan's traditional independent and non-aligned status; self-determination of the Afghan people; and return of the refugees with safety and honor. As part of this effort, we support the on-going UN proximity talks. However, these talks have not yet addressed the central issue of Soviet troop withdrawal. The Soviets have insisted that this is a bilateral issue between themselves and the Afghan regime.

The President's initiative, by emphasizing the need for negotiation between the parties directly involved in the conflicts, would force the Soviets to come to terms with the fundamental reality in Afghanistan -- the existence of a broadly based national liberation movement. The second level of the new initiative supports and complements our commitment to the UN process to serve as a guarantor of a negotiated political settlement. U.S.-Soviet guarantees of non-interference by external forces would reaffirm arrangements already worked out between the warring parties. Such guarantees would apply both to withdrawal of foreign troops and to the elimination of outside flow of arms. The third level, by providing generous assistance to war-torn Afghanistan, would assure the smooth reintegration of the massive refugee population into the economy and provide a basis for reconstruction of the country.

3. Cambodia

The December 1978 invasion and subsequent occupation of Cambodia by Vietnamese troops created a major threat to the stability of Southeast Asia and a direct threat to Thailand. In addition, the earlier establishment of the Soviet base at Cam Ranh Bay, which is related to Moscow's support of Hanoi's military efforts, increased the danger of military incidents between US and Soviet naval and air units. In diplomatic exchanges, the US has urged Moscow to persevere Hanoi of the need for a political settlement based on the withdrawal of its troops, as advocated by UN resolutions, the ICK, and Asean.

The United States strongly supports the efforts of the members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) to obtain a political solution to the problem of Cambodia based on the essential elements worked out by the 1981 U.N.-sponsored International Conference of Kampuchea (ICK): complete withdrawal of foreign forces; UN supervised free elections, and a UN peace-keeping force. The U.S. believes that a durable settlement acceptable to the Cambodian people and to their neighbors must be based on these principles. These same principles have been included in six successive resolutions adopted overwhelmingly by the UN General Assembly.

The President's proposal is an integral part of U.S. support for ASEAN and the leadership on the Cambodian problem which its members, as the countries most directly concerned, have shown. The principles enunciated by the President in his address -- negotiations, withdrawal of foreign forces, an end to hostilities -- parallel those of the ICK. In July 1985, the ASEAN countries proposed indirect talks between the Cambodian resistance forces and a Vietnamese delegation including representatives of Hanoi's Cambodian clients. Such talks, if accepted by Vietnam, could lead to the negotiations between the warring parties called for in the President's initiative.

4. Nicaragua

In Nicaragua, a Soviet-supported regime has betrayed the democratic goals of the 1979 revolution, moving increasingly toward totalitarianism and generating a large and growing indigenous armed resistance. The Sandinistas' refusal to address the legitimate grievances of Nicaragua's armed and civilian
more

opposition and the increasing reliance on force -- both in its domestic and foreign relations -- have led to spiraling regional tensions; Sandinista policies of force have taken a heavy toll in human lives and scarce economic resources and have threatened the region's fragile democracies.

U.S. policy toward Nicaragua is premised on four basic goals: internal reconciliation through implementation of promises made to the O.A.S. in 1979 for a democratic, pluralistic society guaranteeing full civil, political and religious rights; termination of Sandinista support for insurgency in El Salvador and other Central American countries; termination of Nicaragua's military-security ties with the Soviet bloc and Cuba and the departure from Nicaragua of military-security advisors from those countries; and reduction of Nicaragua's military apparatus to a level of full types of armament compatible with those of other regional states.

The United States has consistently called on the Sandinistas to seek a peaceful resolution of Nicaragua's civil war by engaging in discussions with leaders of the armed resistance to address substantively the legitimate grievances which have compelled a resort to arms. Negotiations envisioned under the President's initiative would be directed toward eliminating the major sources of regional concern: the presence of large numbers of Soviet bloc and Cuban advisors and technicians; the massive influx of military hardware from those countries; and the direct role of the Soviet bloc and Cuba in crafting Nicaragua's military, foreign, and domestic policies. U.S./Soviet negotiations on Nicaragua would complement the negotiations among the five Central American countries, mediated by the Contradora group, to seek a comprehensive settlement of the region's problems. The third stage is essentially a reiteration of our long-standing proposal to offer major economic and developmental assistance in exchange for substantive progress in meeting our basic goals, as described above.

5. Ethiopia

Our longstanding policy is to respect the territorial integrity of Ethiopia. We do not support the separatist movements active in that country. The insurgents are divided up into many different groups, the two largest of which are Marxist-oriented. Some of these groups have been supported by Libya.

Ethiopia is a key nation in the Horn of Africa, a strategically important part of the world that is torn by internal strife and regional political conflicts. Within Ethiopia, a repressive regime is at war with its people. We believe that no military solution is possible, despite the supply of large quantities of Soviet military aid and the presence of 1700 Soviet military advisors and 2500 Cuban combat troops. Moreover, pursuit of a military solution has led to cross border violence and serious aggravation of regional rivalries. The Ethiopian leadership has not been willing to seriously negotiate dissident demands for greater autonomy. Given its large involvement, the Soviet Union has responsibility to help bring about peace within Ethiopia and with its neighbors. If the Soviets are willing to work for peaceful reconciliation in Ethiopia, the U.S. is prepared to increase its longstanding efforts to promote better relations among all the countries of the region.